



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,236	02/15/2000	Swain W. Porter	0034646.P008	7611

25943 7590 12/12/2002

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
10260 SW GREENBURG ROAD
SUITE 820
PORTLAND, OR 97223

EXAMINER

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.


B

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/504,236

Applicant(s)

PORTER, SWAIN W. 

Examiner

April L Baugh

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 February 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1, reference numbers 136, 152, and 154; Fig.3b, reference numbers 312, 314, 316, and 318; and Figure 7, reference numbers 702, 704, and 706. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 2143

122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claim 1, 3-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32, 39-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Shankarappa et al.

Referring to claim 1, Shankarappa et al. teaches a method comprising: a computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site; the computer providing a first email address for use to register the user with said first web site; the computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second website; and the computer providing a second email address, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 3, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of an email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 1, lines 32-34 and column 4, lines 54-57 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 4, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises a first user identifier and an address of an email service provider, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier, and the address of the same email service provider (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al. and column 1, lines 32-34 and column 4, lines 54-57 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer comprises selecting said

Art Unit: 2143

first/second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses pre-provided to said computer (column 10, lines 10-12 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 6, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the method further comprises the computer pre-obtaining the distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer comprises the computer dynamically obtaining said first/second email address from an email service provider (column 10, lines 10-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 12, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises notifying an email service provider of the usage of the first and second email address, including addresses of the first and the second web site (column 1, lines 47-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 13, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein each of said notification is performed integrally as said first/second email address is provided to said user for use to register the user with the first/second web site (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 14, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web site (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

. Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 20, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is a selected one of a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (column 1, lines 22-23 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 21, Shankarappa et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.); the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 22, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 47-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 23, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selections of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 47-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 24, Shankarappa et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a first email address from an email service provider (column 10, lines 12-17

. Art Unit: 2143

of Shankarappa et al.); the e-device employing the first email address to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.); the e-device obtaining a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address, from the email service provider (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.); and the e-device employing the second email address to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 25, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the first email address to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 47-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding to claim 26, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made integrally when the e-device requests said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 27, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made after the e-device having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 28, Shankarappa et al. teaches a method comprising: a email service provider registering a user; and the email service provider providing at least a first and a second email address (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.), that are separate and distinct, to the user for use by the user to communicate with a first and a second communication partner or

. Art Unit: 2143

group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 29, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 30, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 31, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 32, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 39, Shankarappa et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.), to selecting a first of said distinct email addresses

Art Unit: 2143

to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP), and to select a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 40, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 39, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) further enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to notify the email service provider of said selection of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 41, Shankarappa et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.), and correspondingly earmarking said first and second distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 42, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 41, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to notify of said

Art Unit: 2143

employment of the first and second email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 47-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 43, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications integrally when requesting for said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 44, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications after having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 45, Shankarappa et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) design to enable the server (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user, and to provide at least a first and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the user (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.) for use by the user to communicate with a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 46, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device)

Art Unit: 2143

used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 47, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Referring to claim 48, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Regarding claim 49, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (column 1, lines 46-48 of Shankarappa et al.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2, 7, 8, 10, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Shankarappa et al. in view of Linden et al.

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 2, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 7, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 6(column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach of pre-generation of email addresses. Linden et al. teaches the method further comprises the email service provider pre-generating the distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by pre-generating email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 8, Shankarappa et al. the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer (column 10, lines 10-12 of Shankarappa et al.).

Art Unit: 2143

Shankarappa et al. does not teach dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer. Linden et al. teaches dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Referring to claim 10, Shankarappa et al. the method of claim 9, wherein each of said dynamically obtaining comprises the email service provider selecting said first/second email address (column 10, lines 10-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach pre-generation of distinct email addresses. Linden et al. teaches selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of pre-generated distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by pre-generating distinct email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 11, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 9 (column 10, lines 10-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address. Linden et al. teaches the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it

Art Unit: 2143

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by having the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

6. Claim 15-19, 33-38, 50-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Shankarappa et al. in view of McCormick et al.

Referring to claim 15, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address. McCormick et al. teaches receiving emails addressed to said first and second email addresses; organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address (column 2, lines 25-27 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Regarding claim 16, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 15 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Art Unit: 2143

Shankarappa et al. does not teach organizing of said received emails. McCormick et al. teaches organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses were sent by said first/second web site or not (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by organizing of said received emails because this notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 17, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 16 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site. McCormick et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses not sent by said first/second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first/second web site (column 2, lines 45-49 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 18, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 17 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Art Unit: 2143

Shankarappa et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user. McCormick et al. teaches said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user (column 2, lines 53-56 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by having the deletion performed in response to an instruction of said user because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 19, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 18 (column 1, lines 16-18 and lines 27-28 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button. McCormick et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 5, lines 34-36 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 33, Shankarappa et al. teaches of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches a email service provider

Art Unit: 2143

receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user; and the email service provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 34, Shankarappa et al. teaches of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email

Art Unit: 2143

addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 35, Shankarappa et al. teaches of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches receiving emails, from an email service provider, wherein the emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses; and presenting said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by having the emails characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 36, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 35 of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address. McCormick et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address

Art Unit: 2143

not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address (column 2, lines 45-49 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 37, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 36 of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to user instruction. McCormick et al. teaches deletion is performed in response to user instruction (column 2, lines 53-56 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by having deletion performed in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 38, Shankarappa et al. teaches the method of claim 37 of email addresses (column 10, lines 12-17 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. McCormick et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 5, lines 34-36 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it

Art Unit: 2143

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 50, Shankarappa et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches receive emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user, and to organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Art Unit: 2143

Referring to claim 51, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 50, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.) (when executed) further enable the apparatus to

Shankarappa et al. does not teach provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by providing said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 52, Shankarappa et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. McCormick et al. teaches receiving emails from an email service provider, the emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended

Art Unit: 2143

communication partners of each of said email addresses, and to present said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 2, lines 25-27 and 50-51 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 53, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 52, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address. McCormick et al. teaches delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address (column 2, lines 45-49 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 54, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach perform said deletion in response to user instruction. McCormick et al. teaches perform said deletion in response to user instruction (column 2, lines 53-56 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by performing said deletion in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 55, Shankarappa et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 54, wherein the programming instructions (column 10, lines 30-32 of Shankarappa et al.).

Shankarappa et al. does not teach provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. McCormick et al. teaches provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 5, lines 34-36 of McCormick et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the secure system and method for website subscribers of Shankarappa et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Art Unit: 2143


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9149 for regular communications and 703-746-9149 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB
December 3, 2002


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100